



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

wrongly prefers *amorum* from John of Salisbury. I should add a reference to Persius vi. 72, *morosa vena* where *morosa* seems to be used in the same sense of *irritabilis* rather than of *fastidiosus*. The limitations of space preclude the discussion of a fuller selection from my marginalia.

I can only notice the commentary briefly. In general, though the passages for annotation are chosen with discrimination, the commentary is less exhaustive than that of Némethy, and perhaps affords a more limited opportunity for judging the place of Persius in the development of satire as a literary form. Horatian parallels should have been quoted in larger number, as I have indicated above. Especially in Satire I and Satire V, 1-20, the vital part played by Horace's *Ars poetica* in molding the literary ideals and expression of Persius should be more clearly indicated. On the other hand, the full citations of the best modern handbooks on Roman life and morals are a feature of this commentary, which is especially well adapted to what we may call the study of the external life depicted in Roman satire. In several places also we have fuller restatements of old interpretations latterly discarded, which will commend themselves to students of Persius. Thus in i. 134, *edictum* is rightly explained as the play-bill rather than the praetor's edict. In ii. 68, *haec* is rightly referred to *pulpa*. In iii. 105, the interpretation of *porta* as the house door seems correct. In vi. 51, however, I doubt the interpretation of *exossatus*. Gildersleeve's note contains the best statement of the difficulties involved in the interpretation of this vexed passage. I regret that I am not competent to criticize the Dutch translation. Students of Persius are to be congratulated in having in the editions of Némethy and Van Wageningen two scholarly and individual commentaries which admirably supplement each other. The clearness of the Latin of the prolegomena and commentary are worthy of the best traditions of Dutch scholarship.

GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

De C. Maecenatis Fragmentis. By PAULUS LUNDERSTEDT. [Commentationes Philologae Ienenses, Vol. IX, Fasc. 2.] Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. 119. M. 5.

The time seems destined to come when every Roman writer, no matter how scant his literary legacy, will find somebody to compose a $\muέγα \betaιβλίον$ about him. Nor can we see any great evil in this, provided the big book is not duplicated every few years with insignificant changes. Herr Lunderstedt lists so many who have collected and commented on the fragments of Maecenas that he finds it necessary to justify himself for increasing the bibliography. The work of Harder, his chief predecessor, *Ueber die Fragmente des Maecenas*, would, it seems, have sufficed the philological world, had he added something "de genere dicendi similibusque rebus," and "not been unfor-

tunate in so many of his statements." But while much that Herr Lunderstedt has written in his chapter on the style of Maecenas is commendable, his metrical analysis of Augustus' parody of that writer's prose (*Macrobius Sat. ii. 4. 12*) into trochaic, cretic, choriambic, and iambic measures (p. 20) is luckily concealed in a foreign tongue from the ordinary "man in the street," who might disrespectfully liken it to the discovery of lyric poetry in the definitions of a dictionary. If the reviewer had only been sufficiently infected by the bacillus Zielinskius, he would venture to extract "non solum numeri simplices sed maxime artificiosi et continuati" (p. 103) from the editor's own excellent Latin. His commentary is so exhaustive, if not exhausting, that it would have delighted old Nicolaus Perrottus of *Cornucopia* fame himself, but it will prove a great help to anybody who may be halted by the vexatious language of Maecenas, who certainly deserved the censure of Seneca for his "eloquentiam ebrii hominis."

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

P. Papini *Stati Silvae* iterum edidit ALFREDUS KLOTZ. Leipzig:
Teubner, 1911. M. 2.40.

In the beginning of his new preface, Klotz states that it was his chief purpose, in the preface to his first edition, to show that the Matritensis was the source of all other known codices of the *Silvae* and to establish the value of Politian's marginal notes in the Corsinian exemplar of the *editio princeps*. He says that all now agree as to the primacy of the Matritensis, but that some are still in doubt as to whether this codex was the one sent into Italy or a copy of it. This question he discusses at some length and concludes thus: "I no longer claim that Politian used a copy of the Matritensis (a view I defended in *Hermes XXXVIII*, 1903), but hold, with Thielscher, that he had the genuine Poggian codex."

In the course of his argument, he makes the following points: the ancient codex found in Helvetia by Poggius did not cross the Alps and so could not have been used by Politian; the Matritensis was not written in Italy but came from some other place; the writing was not, however, Carolingian as the editor once thought; Politian's statement that the codex he used was *brought* to Italy by Poggius proves that he was ignorant of the real facts; the codex which Politian had was divided into two parts, not mutilated, as is usually understood; Politian erred in the one or the other of two points—either he did not employ the codex sent by Poggius into Italy, or he did not give correct report on verse i. 4, 86a when he said that it was lacking in his codex; assumption of the former involves one in greater difficulties, for some of Politian's notes, taken from the book of Poggius, show, when compared with the Matritensis, that the latter was surely in his hands; Politian, therefore, simply made a false statement when he said that verse i, 4, 86a was not